

Utah State Building Board



MEETING

November 7, 2001

MINUTES

Utah State Building Board Members in attendance:

Joseph A. Jenkins, Chair
Keith Stepan, Vice-Chair
Larry Jardine

Utah State Building Board Members via telephone:

Haze Hunter
Kay Calvert

DFCM and Guests in attendance:

Robert Woodhead	Division of Facilities Construction & Management
Kenneth Nye	Division of Facilities Construction & Management
Jack Quintana	Division of Facilities Construction & Management
Shannon Lofgreen	Division of Facilities Construction & Management
Leslee Chavez	Division of Facilities Construction & Management
Alyn Lunceford	Division of Facilities Construction & Management
Doug Fullmer	Division of Facilities Construction & Management
S'ean Crawford	Division of Facilities Construction & Management
Dave Williams	Division of Facilities Construction & Management
Vic Middleton	Division of Facilities Construction & Management
Raylene Ireland	Department of Administrative Services
Kevin Walthers	Legislative Fiscal Analyst's Office
Randa Bezzant	Governor's Office of Planning and Budget
Jackie McGill	Spectrum & Bennion
Brent Windley	Utah State University
Darrell Hart	Utah State University
Greg Peay	Department of Corrections
Deanne Mousley	State Fire Marshal's Office
John Huish	University of Utah
Leon Nelson	Layton Construction
Rolynne Christensen	VCBO Architecture

Elizabeth Mitchell
Bill Juszczak
David Hart
Norm Tarbox

AIA of Utah
UDOT
Capitol Preservation Board
Higher Education

On Wednesday, November 7, 2001, a regularly scheduled Utah State Building Board meeting was held in the Utah State Capitol Committee Room 129, Salt Lake City, Utah. Chairman Jenkins called the meeting to order at 1:05pm.

☐ APPROVAL OF MINUTES OF OCTOBER 15, 2001

Chairman Jenkins sought a motion on the minutes of the October 15 regularly scheduled meeting.

MOTION: Larry Jardine moved to approve the minutes of the Board meeting on October 15. The motion was seconded by Keith Stepan and passed unanimously.

☐ UPDATE ON ADDITIONS TO THE STATE CAPITOL
.....

David Hart provided an update regarding the renovations and additions to the Capitol regarding the design of the building, parking during the construction, and security issues.

Mr. Hart stated the wing additions would be an all granite exterior similar to the design of the Capitol, and the critical elements on the columns, cornices, and shapes will be maintained. The window modules, parapet, height of the columns, and the spacing of the columns are similar to the rhythm created on the Capitol.

Mr. Hart displayed an inside view of the plaza and noted the entrance was one area where the Preservation Board was deviating from a historical or classical type building versus more modern. Part of the Interior Secretaries guidelines for Historic Preservation stated that additions to historic buildings should have a sense of their own period and time.

A separate sketch provided a view of the overall sight design around the center courtyard. The Preservation Board hoped to receive a donation for a fountain within the center courtyard to provide a centerpiece with perennials and lawn panels, which could be used for various events and activities. Several granite circulation paths would surround the courtyard.

The Preservation Board had looked at several studies comparing granite out of a canyon

and cold springs granite for the exterior material on the buildings. The studies determined that cold springs granite was approximately 22-30% more expensive than the Italian or Spanish granites, which they have focused their bidding process on.

Mr. Hart identified how parking would be impacted by the construction of the two buildings, the staging areas, and the contractor areas. The covered parking would attempt to be held open at all times, but possible periods of closure would be during the summer months when the use of the garage could be decreased. Parking lot C would be for employees and approximately 200-300 stalls would be lost during the construction period. The area in front of the Capitol will be secured and closed, due to concerns with individuals getting too close to the Capitol.

Due to the September 11 incidents, the Budget sub-committee and the Preservation sub-committee asked Mr. Hart to address several security issues with regards to how to proceed in the future. Mr. Hart felt providing a fence around the Capitol grounds would stop vehicles from making a quick ascent onto the grounds. The fence would be a permanent decorative type fence.

The Preservation Board also desired to increase the security of the underground parking areas and posed the potential of a security arm and access card reader. While this is not a perfect solution, it could be implemented quickly and other issues could be addressed as they arise.

With the exception of the south doors of the Capitol, the Preservation Board desired panic hardware to allow the lock down of the doors should the building come under threat. Because of their historic nature and massive size, the south doors could not be retrofitted with panic hardware.

The Preservation Board encouraged all departments within the Capitol to put a card reader on their main entrance door to provide additional security. They also discussed the magnetometers at the entry doors and could be included in future renovations in the Capitol, as a number will be received during the Olympics.

In the future masterplan diagram, the perimeter fence was represented as an oval perimeter originally recommended by Ohlmstead. The fence would be five feet and would be 5-10 feet away from the walkway to dispel the feeling of being enclosed. The gates and openings would be accommodated with spring loads in case of the need for lock down. The fence would have a bollard type system built into it and would be sturdy enough to stop approaching vehicles. The bollards would be three feet high and would be enabled to collapse as a net if hit. The above portion of the fence would be open and would be a period specific black decorative fence. The fence could cost approximately \$586,000 and

the controls could cost approximately \$250,000.

The Preservation Board also requested a security desk at the east entrance of the capitol to allow for screening. Once the masterplan was complete, the majority of the public parking would funnel through the Capitol from the east. The security desk was estimated to cost approximately \$5000. Utah Control provided a bid for the security hardware at approximately \$15,000 and the interior doors security card access was estimated at \$32,000 bringing the total to \$900,000. The budget sub-committee, Preservation sub-committee and the Governor have recommended this amount for approval.

The Preservation Board had improvement funding left from last year, as they have been unable to proceed with some projects due to time constraints. These projects include \$21,000 left over from the mortar and joint repairs, the State Office Building HVAC and plumbing modifications, which could be held off until next year, the senate skylight, the sidewalks and curved wall repair and a miscellaneous account used for various projects with a current balance of \$130,000. Some maintenance funds were discussed with DFCM and \$47,000 in emergency funds may be requested for exterior hardware and interior carpentries. In the FY2001 planning dollars there was \$310,000 allocated for improvements due to the tornado. As the funds were already for site improvements, they could be shifted. The projects total \$963,000, and would allow an approximate \$53,000 surplus. They hoped to not require the use of the emergency funds, but needed to inform the Board they may be requested if necessary.

The Preservation Board requested approval from the Building Board to shift the improvement dollars to deal with the security issues. The request of Mr. Hart did not include the authorization of the \$47,000 in emergency funds. He noted the Preservation Board wished for the security issues to be completed prior to the Olympics.

MOTION: Keith Stepan moved to approve the reallocation of improvement dollars with the intent to currently exclude the \$47,000 of emergency fund. The motion was seconded by Larry Jardine and passed unanimously.

❑ DESIGN OF ROOFING PROJECTS.....

Kenneth Nye explained DFCM's normal process for capital improvement funds includes the legislature appropriating the funds at the beginning of March, and DFCM then prepares a recommendation for the Board's review and approval in May. Some projects are sensitive to the summer season and are challenged with completing in the same summer. This is especially true with roofing projects, therefore, DFCM requested the Board approve six large roofing projects that currently require the services of a design architect/engineer for preparing bidding documents. Most of the projects involve some seismic issues needing to

be upgraded on the buildings as the roof is redone. By following the normal process of waiting until spring to start the design, those roofs cannot be completed next summer. DFCM wished to start the design now in order to have the Board allocate capital improvement funds next spring and hopefully be completed next summer.

DFCM proposed funding the design costs of \$144,000 through the balance in the emergency fund to cover the design costs until next spring when capital improvement money could be allocated. Currently there is \$532,000 in the emergency fund. This would decrease the amount to \$390,000, which would be adequate for the balance of the year. DFCM was not asking to redirect the money formally, but allow the projects to come forward through the regular allocation of funding in the spring. However, those funds would be at risk in the emergency fund to cover the design costs if they did not receive any capital improvement funding the next year.

MOTION: Keith Stepan moved to authorize the use of the emergency fund for the roofing project design fees. The motion was seconded by Larry Jardine and passed unanimously.

☐ RECONSIDERATION OF CAPITAL DEVELOPMENT RECOMMENDATIONS FOR UDOT

In a previous meeting with UDOT, DFCM learned the budget difficulties encountered by the State has made it very unlikely, that they will have sufficient funds in the transportation fund to cover the two new maintenance stations included on the Board's non-state funded list.

Kenneth Nye distributed the final results of the Board's action in October for the state-funded requests and the recommendations for the non-state funded projects. The UDOT projects were viewed on the non-state list because they were funded out of the transportation fund as opposed to general state dollars. UDOT has requested the two projects listed be removed and replaced with a new item. The previously recommended projects include the Huntington maintenance facility at \$3.6 million and the Kamas maintenance station at \$4.1 million.

Mr. Juszczak previously met with DFCM to discuss the budget for next year and felt the budget would be short, however they wanted to be included in the Building Board process just in case. UDOT management felt strongly that the budget would not be available, but desired to proceed with the land purchases. In Mr. Juszczak's estimated budget, he included \$300,000 for land purchases, which was then removed due to discrepancies with the Legislative Analyst's Office. He was unsure if a request to the Board was required, but he understood UDOT had authority to purchase land for highway purposes and interpreted that to include stations also. Regardless, Mr. Juszczak requested to use \$300,000 to

purchase as many as possible of Huntington, Kamas, Vernal and Heber City sites with hopes to ask for the construction dollars next year.

Kay Calvert questioned the cost of the property in Heber. Mr. Juszczak was unsure, but the original offer for both neighbors was to trade suitable property of equal nature. They also hoped that proceeds received from the land would also go towards the construction costs. Chair Jenkins asked if UDOT has prioritized any of the projects. Mr. Juszczak stated that upon reviewing the priority list, UDOT had approximately 40 buildings that needed to be addressed through relocation or remodeling. He hoped to address one or two projects a year. Dave Miles had indicated he felt like Heber should take priority due to the problems with traffic, but the projects were definitely negotiable. Emery County was willing to buy out UDOT for the Huntington land at the building value and would be willing to sell the approximate 16 acres, however only 10-11 acres was usable land due to wetlands. The County was willing to trade the building value on the existing site for that land plus \$70,000 but would do appraisals beforehand to determine the final cost.

Chair Jenkins sought a motion.

MOTION: Larry Jardine moved to allow UDOT to use \$300,000 to purchase new maintenance sites and remove the others. Keith Stepan seconded the motion.

Kenneth Nye offered clarification on the motion and assumed it would be to replace the two items on the recommendation list with this request. Chair Jenkins affirmed.

The motion passed unanimously.

❑ ADMINISTRATIVE REPORTS OF UNIVERSITY OF UTAH AND UTAH STATE UNIVERSITY

John Huish reported on the University of Utah and noted the University awarded two design agreements to A/E firms for roofing improvement projects. One significant construction contract was awarded to Layton Construction Company representing themselves as construction manager and general contractor for the construction management of the Huntsman Cancer Institute Phase II. The project is underway and has a scheduled completion date of May 2004. Mr. Huish stated the reserve fund currently had \$289,000 and he did not see any immediate need for those funds.

The dedication on the bandstand at Fort Douglas was held November 10. Mr. Huish invited the Board to tour the facilities at Fort Douglas and offered to host a Building Board meeting in the Officers Club conference center after the Olympics.

MOTION: Kay Calvert moved to accept the administrative report of the University of Utah. The motion was seconded by Keith Stepan and passed unanimously.

Brent Windley of Utah State University gave the administrative report and noted one new construction contract dealing with the landscaping around the institutional residence. The University is currently in the midst of trying to sell the lots in the subdivision at \$60,000 a piece, however no offers had been finalized.

MOTION: Haze Hunter moved to approve the administrative report of Utah State University. The motion was seconded by Kay Calvert and passed unanimously.

❑ ADMINISTRATIVE REPORTS FOR DFCM

Kenneth Nye noted the National Guard lease in Orem has a high rental rate due to it being located in the mall as a recruiting office.

The contingency reserve increases stemmed from the new projects that were funded. Additional projects from the new funding would be identified in future reports. The decreases were due to the Salt Lake Community College Jordan Campus. This was discussed briefly in September when the contract went through and it was just now showing up on the contingency fund. There was 125 feet of piping not included in the original contract for a tunnel extension.

The SUU PE building was reported prematurely and dealt with the Owners Controlled Insurance Program (OCIP). The balancing is still being finalized on the project. Statute requires an annual evaluation on the balance in the contingency reserve and the project reserve in order for the legislature to redirect a portion of funds if determined to be excess. Per the analysis of DFCM, they did not believe there was excess balance in the contingency reserve however, it is caught up for the first time in eight years. DFCM has struggled to bring the fund back to a fully funded status and have now achieved that with the current balance.

As DFCM evaluated the project reserve balance, they felt there was an excess balance currently of around \$800,000 as a result of achieving savings on bids on projects. This amount could be redirected by the Legislature per statute.

The planning fund showed the reimbursement for the CEU Main building project. The Snow and Dixie College issues will be reimbursed as funding issues are resolved.

Robert Woodhead reported the design and development of the Snow College project funding was under question. Originally approximately \$16 million was funded, but the request was for \$18 million. Snow began to work with the \$18 million figure under previous direction, which caused a \$2 million spread between what was allocated for the project and what is available for the project. Snow felt they could cover the difference and requested proceeding with the design at the \$18 million amount. They also desired to change the site of the building due to the soil conditions. Kenneth Nye stated DFCM agreed due to cost savings and the overall campus masterplan.

MOTION: Larry Jardine moved to accept the administrative report of DFCM. The motion was seconded by Keith Stepan and passed unanimously.

☐ 2002 BUILDING BOARD SCHEDULE.....

The Board agreed to move ahead with the schedule as presented.

Kenneth Nye pointed out the Legislature would start an interim session on January 7. DFCM anticipated the capital budget discussions with the Legislative Committee would occur from January 7 – January 17.

☐ UPCOMING VALUE BASED PROCUREMENT SELECTIONS

There were no new project selection committee delegation issues to address.

☐ ADJOURNMENT.....

MOTION: Kay Calvert moved to adjourn at 2:12pm. The motion was seconded by Larry Jardine and passed unanimously.

Minutes prepared by: Shannon Lofgreen